

for job creation and investment in our State.

In Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, we have rich deposits of critical minerals, along with other great projects, like the Line 3 Replacement Project.

Nancy has long understood what these opportunities could mean for our region and spearheaded this locally-driven movement to fight for good-paying mining and energy jobs. Through her exceptional work and advocacy, Nancy has helped to make great progress in our local communities.

Since arriving in Congress, it has been my pleasure to work alongside Nancy to unleash the economic engine in Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District.

She has served as an incredible resource to me, and while I will miss her expertise and leadership, I wish her nothing but the best in this next chapter of her life.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mrs. BOEBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in defense of those who cannot defend themselves, the voiceless, the unborn.

I rise to say what we all know to be true, that human life begins at conception, because we know science is real.

The more than 60 million babies that have been ripped from their mother's womb since *Roe v. Wade* were no less valuable or worthy of life than any of us here today. No taxpayer should ever be forced to pay for abortion.

Abortion is not healthcare, it is murder. I will not stand by quietly. I say Planned Parenthood can go fund themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHARLES ROSE

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Charles Rose, a good friend of mine. He was a brave

veteran who passed away on July 24 at 97 years old.

Charles was a corporal in the United States Marine Corps during World War II. He fought in the Battles of Tarawa, Saipan, and Tinian in the Pacific, and was awarded a Bronze Star with valor for his bravery.

In 1953, Charles married the love of his life, Jane, and they had four sons: Steve, Tim, Mark, and Dennis.

I was honored to speak about Steve on the House floor a few months ago after he passed away. He was a great veteran, just like his dad.

Charles also had 12 grandchildren and 28 great-grandchildren, who loved him dearly, and they were his pride and joy.

Charles worked hard all his life. In 1969, he decided to go into business for himself. He founded his own septic tank business where the motto is "A Flush Beats a Full House Every Time." It is still going strong today, being run by his sons and grandsons. He also became a Baptist minister and inspired everyone he knew with his love for the Lord.

Charles always used to say, "plain talk is easy understood." He hit me with that nugget of wisdom several times, and I won't forget it. It was an honor to call him my friend, and he will be missed by those who knew him. Rest in peace, brother.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4346, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4373, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4505, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

Mr. MORELLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117-110) on the resolution (H. Res. 567) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4373) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4505) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4346, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4373, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4505, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 567, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 567

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4373) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 6 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. After debate pursuant to section 5 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 7 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 7. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to section 5 of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 8. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 9. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4505) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 10 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 11 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. After debate pursuant to section 9 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 11 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 11. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to section 9 of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 12. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 11 of this resolution are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1030

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend and colleague from the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, House Resolution 567. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4346, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees.

The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman RYAN, makes in order 12 amendments, provides en bloc authority for Chairwoman DELAURO or her designee, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration H.R. 4373, the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, under a

structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees.

The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman LEE, makes in order 36 amendments, provides en bloc authority for Chairwoman DELAURO or her designee, and provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4505, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees.

It self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman CARTWRIGHT, makes in order 61 amendments, provides en bloc authority for Chairwoman DELAURO or her designee, and provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise and speak in favor of critical investments that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee have worked tirelessly to secure for the American people. First, I would like to congratulate Chairwoman DELAURO on her exemplary leadership in bringing us a package of legislation that we can be proud to support and as well commend Chairs CARTWRIGHT, RYAN, and LEE on their dedication to ensuring America's greatest needs are reflected in this year's appropriations bills.

The underlying package we are considering today includes fiscal year 2022 funding for the Commerce, Justice, and Science; Legislative Branch; and State and Foreign Operations appropriations bills that invest in the future of America's hardworking families and America's engagement around the globe.

These investments are more than just a commitment to our districts, they are firm action items that will help Americans throughout our country grow and heal as we emerge from this pandemic.

The Commerce-Justice-Science bill supports good-paying American jobs, fosters groundbreaking scientific research, and helps to make our communities safer. These critical programs include investments in economic development in distressed communities with support for small businesses, including small- and medium-sized American manufacturers.

This package also increases funding to address gender-based violence in our communities, supports programs to reduce gun violence, and helps us tackle the opioid crisis.

I, for one, know that my community in Rochester, New York, will benefit greatly from the priorities secured in the CJS appropriations bill, and I look forward to delivering on our promise to support safer communities with funding for local law enforcement while bolstering police and criminal justice

reform, increasing funding for community-based violence intervention initiatives, and expanding gun violence prevention efforts.

The Legislative Branch appropriations bill strengthens congressional capacity to recruit a diverse and talented workforce while investing in efforts to protect our Capitol. After hearing firsthand yesterday from the brave officers who protected all of us on January 6, it is our duty to return the favor by doing our job and showing full support for our Capitol Police force.

The insurrection on January 6 left widespread physical damage to the Capitol Complex and emotional trauma for Members, congressional employees, and Capitol Police. This measure is essential to protecting the Capitol and ensuring that we can continue to do the work of the American people. It provides funding to support training, recruitment, retention, and readiness of the Capitol Police force.

The State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bills supports the world's most vulnerable with foreign assistance to meet urgent humanitarian needs, many of which have been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

This appropriations bill will promote democracy with funding to support allies and partners of the United States, particularly to counter governments that undermine the core values of our democracy and of democracy around the world.

Additionally, it confronts climate change with funding for global efforts to reduce emissions, advances women's rights by increasing funding for family planning, increases United Nations Population Fund funding, and repeals restrictions on safe and legal abortion.

This is a package I am proud to take home to my constituents, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reflect on whom we are here to represent and support, make good on our promises to the American people, and pass this rule and these critical appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and my friend from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of three appropriations measures for fiscal year 2022. I first would like to start off by thanking Chair DELAUNO and Ranking Member GRANGER and their committee staff for their tireless work on these measures. It is truly an honor to be part of the appropriations process on the committee, and I am very grateful for their efforts.

Unfortunately, though, Mr. Speaker, like the package of seven funding measures considered yesterday, the majority marked these three bills to unworkable 302(b) allocations, and the

package before us today stands absolutely no chance of becoming law.

Collectively, these three bills provide for \$147 billion in spending, which is a 13 percent increase from fiscal year 2021.

Overall, the majority's proposed spending levels increase nondefense discretionary spending by 17 percent while only increasing defense spending by 1 percent. That is not even enough to keep up with inflation.

This is at a time when our Nation and when our military faces threats from China, Russia, and Iran. Because of these threats, we should be investing in the U.S. and our partner nations, not underfunding our military and national security programs and obligations abroad.

While H.R. 4373, which funds the Department of State and Foreign Operations, does include support for our allies, Israel, Jordan, and Taiwan, it also places conditions on our strategic partner Egypt. These conditions will undercut national security efforts which is another hit to our defense operations.

Further, H.R. 4373 removes longstanding bipartisan policies including the Helms amendment which prohibits foreign aid from being used for abortions. It also doubles funding to the United Nations Population Fund. This organization has historically supported coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization.

Finally, this bill provides for more than \$3 billion for climate change programs, including \$1.6 billion for the Green Climate Fund. Even Secretary Yellen acknowledged the Green Climate Fund has oversight issues and has been mismanaged.

The rule before us today also provides for consideration of H.R. 4505, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. Like H.R. 4373, this bill removes longstanding bipartisan language restricting the Justice Department from spending taxpayer dollars on abortion.

The measure also fails to include four bipartisan Second Amendment protections including two provisions that have been in the CJS bill since fiscal year 2006.

Finally, H.R. 4505 imposes new, unauthorized conditions on many State and local law enforcement programs, including Byrne JAG and COPS. Many of these conditions require legislation to be passed by States and localities and are outside the control of law enforcement agencies. These requirements will effectively defund programs relied on by our Nation's police officers, including initiatives that support training and equipment purchases, active shooter response training, and suicide prevention.

This measure also fails to address the real challenges facing our Nation, including cyberattacks on American companies, extortion plots on critical infrastructure, and the flow of deadly fentanyl at the southern border.

At the end of the day, if my colleagues across the aisle are serious

about enacting appropriations measures before funding runs out at the end of September, it is absolutely critical they remove their far-left, radical policy riders to restore longstanding bipartisan provisions; otherwise, we will face a continuing resolution or a Democrat-driven shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to in response, and I appreciate the comments from my friend, include in the RECORD a 2013 American Progress article titled, "How the Hyde Amendment Discriminates Against Poor Women and Women of Color."

[May 10, 2013]

HOW THE HYDE AMENDMENT DISCRIMINATES AGAINST POOR WOMEN AND WOMEN OF COLOR
(By Jessica Arons and Lindsay Rosenthal)

In 1973 the Supreme Court decided in the landmark case *Roe v. Wade* to recognize the constitutional right to abortion for all women. Forty years later, however, this guarantee remains an empty promise for thousands of poor women and women of color thanks to the Hyde Amendment, an annual appropriations measure first passed in 1976. This provision intentionally discriminates against poor women by prohibiting Medicaid, the health-insurance program for low-income individuals and families, from covering abortion care.

Because of the intersection in our country between race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, this restriction also has a disproportionate impact on women of color. Due to a number of root causes related to inequality, women of color are more likely to qualify for government insurance that restricts abortion coverage, more likely to experience higher rates of unintended pregnancy, and less likely to be able to pay for an abortion out of pocket. The Hyde Amendment therefore does not only undermine gender equity, but it also violates principles of racial and economic justice.

The Hyde Amendment discriminates against poor women.

Congress passed the Hyde Amendment in order to deny poor women access to abortion. Former Rep. Henry Hyde (R-IL), the law's sponsor, admitted during the debate of his proposal that he was targeting poor women. "I certainly would like to prevent, if I could legally, anybody having an abortion, a rich woman, a middle-class woman, or a poor woman," he said. "Unfortunately, the only vehicle available is the Medicaid bill."

1 in 10 women of reproductive age in the United States relies on Medicaid for their health coverage. By prohibiting Medicaid from covering abortion services, the Hyde Amendment has used the primary source of health care for low-income women to restrict access to abortion.

Poor women face significant disparities when it comes to reproductive health. Compared with higher-income women, poor women's rates of unintended pregnancy and abortion are each five times as high, and their unplanned birth rate is six times as high. These disparities are rooted in deeply entrenched inequities in the areas of health-insurance coverage, health care, and medically accurate sex education, as well as other health-promoting resources.

Abortion costs between \$300 and \$950 in the first trimester, making it unaffordable for poor women without insurance coverage. In

2009 more than half of nonelderly adult women enrolled in Medicaid had family incomes below the poverty level; one-quarter had incomes below 50 percent of the poverty level. The monthly income for a family of three living at half the current poverty level is \$813.75.

One in four Medicaid-qualified women who seek an abortion is forced to carry her pregnancy to term because of cost. Many more are forced to delay their procedure for as long as two to three weeks while they raise money, with the costs and risks of the procedure increasing the longer they wait.

The Hyde Amendment discriminates against women of color.

A dissenting Supreme Court opinion recognized that the Hyde Amendment was discriminatory. Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall's dissenting opinion in *Harris v. McRae* noted that the law was "designed to deprive poor and minority women of the constitutional right to choose abortion."

Women of color are disproportionately poor and therefore less likely to be able to pay out of pocket for their health care. According to 2011 census data, 25.5 percent of African Americans and 25 percent of Latinas are living below the poverty level, compared to only 10.4 percent of whites and 12.2 percent of Asians. Moreover, certain groups of Asian and Pacific Islander women face much higher poverty rates than are reflected in the aggregate census data. For example, 67 percent, 66 percent, and 47 percent of people of Laotian, Hmong, and Cambodian descent, respectively, live in poverty in the United States.

Women of color are more likely to be enrolled in government insurance. In 2011, 40.9 percent of African American females and 36.3 percent of Latinas had government-based insurance, including 29.2 percent and 29.6 percent participation, respectively, in Medicaid. In contrast, 32.6 percent of white females and 24.4 percent of Asian American females got their insurance through a government program. While Asian and Pacific Islander women use Medicaid at lower rates for a variety of reasons—only 6 percent were enrolled in the program in 2004—participation is quite high among various subgroups. For example, 20 percent of women of Southeast Asian descent are covered by Medicaid.

Women of color are disproportionately more likely to need an abortion. Black women had the highest unintended pregnancy rate of any racial or ethnic group and more than double that of non-Hispanic white women. The unintended pregnancy rate of Latinas is 78 percent higher than the non-Hispanic rate. These high unintended pregnancy rates are part of the reason women of color seek abortion at higher rates than non-Hispanic whites. Although they represent much smaller segments of the population as a whole, black and Latina women comprise 30 percent and 25 percent of women who have abortions, respectively. Data on Asian and Pacific Islander women's utilization of health services, including abortion, is extremely limited, but one study has shown that 35 percent of pregnancies for Asian and Pacific Islander women end in abortion, compared to 18 percent for non-Hispanic white women.

These health disparities mirror other health disparities that women of color experience. In addition to higher rates of unintended pregnancy and abortion, women of color face higher rates of reproductive cancers, HIV and other sexually transmitted infections, premature births, low birth weights, and maternal and infant morbidity and mortality. They also encounter poorer health outcomes for diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and obesity, among other health conditions.

Root causes of inequality drive the health disparities women of color face. Differential access to treatment, lower levels of respect and competency from health care providers, lack of trust in the medical establishment, lack of accurate information, and a host of other socioeconomic factors lead to poorer outcomes along racial and ethnic lines for overall health indicators, specifically with regard to reproductive health.

The Hyde Amendment treats the rights of women in this country according to two different standards: whether you can afford to pay for your rights or not. That is not equality.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I do note that in my home State of New York we have made the decision for many years to support women in poverty who seek reproductive rights.

Rights are granted to us under the Constitution. Those rights are as fundamental as any other right guaranteed to us under the Constitution, but we don't have economic tests for rights in the United States. So if you have a right, Mr. Speaker, you have a right. We don't say you have the right to free speech as long as you can pay for it. We don't suggest that the right to assemble, the right to have your grievances addressed by your government, the right to petition, the right to press or to select the religion and support the religion that you choose is subject to some kind of economic test. We believe the same should be true for reproductive rights.

So I would just say that in New York it is something that we have supported for many, many years, and we continue to urge support, public dollars for reproductive rights and for women's health, which is very much at stake, particularly in communities of color.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), who is my friend on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule and the underlying bills. I am pleased to see the House make significant progress this week by passing these appropriations bills which include important funding for my district, our communities, and for people all across the country.

I do want to highlight two bipartisan amendments made in order under this rule which I have offered to H.R. 4505, the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations bill.

First is amendment No. 43, which I introduced with Representatives BRIAN BABIN, CRISSY HOULAHAN, and DONALD NORCROSS. Our amendment would elevate the Office of Space Commerce by moving it out of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and into the Office of the Secretary of Commerce. This relatively small office has growing responsibilities to license remote sensing activities or satellite imagery of the Earth and implement a pilot program on space situational awareness.

Elevating this office would better leverage the expertise of the entire de-

partment to support their work and improve interagency collaboration, which is critical to their responsibilities. This proposal has been discussed for years, and it is time to finally make this move. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to further define these new roles and responsibilities.

I also want to highlight another bipartisan amendment No. 44, which I introduced with Representatives KEN BUCK, JOE NEUSE, DOUG LAMBORN, DIANA DEGETTE, and JASON CROW from the Colorado delegation. Our amendment is a plus-minus amendment to NASA's exploration account to show our support for additional funding for the Orion Multipurpose Crew Vehicle totalling \$1.45 billion.

□ 1045

Orion is America's deep space exploration spacecraft which will carry our astronauts back to the Moon and on to Mars as part of the Artemis program. This additional funding for Orion will reduce costs in the program over the long term by maximizing reuse of Orion's systems and establish efficient production flows for the Artemis III Orion spacecraft and beyond.

Our amendment would fully fund Orion while also supporting full funding for the Space Launch System and Exploration Ground Systems, as all three are critical to the Artemis program. The entire NASA Exploration program should be increased to meet these standards, and I hope to work with Chairman CARTWRIGHT and our Appropriations Committee to do just that and support NASA's important work without cutting other programs.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support these amendments, the rule, and the underlying bills.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, my mentor, and the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to the rule, Mr. Speaker. I have two matters I wish to discuss today.

First, I want to speak to the Republican motion to recommit on H.R. 4502, on which the House will be voting in the coming days. While I have many concerns with the bills reported out of the Appropriations Committee, none is more alarming than the systematic removal of longstanding provisions to protect the lives of unborn children and preserve the conscience rights of American taxpayers. This has been done in bill after bill after bill.

If my motion to recommit passes, Republicans will restore essential pro-life protections that have been stripped from these bills.

We will restore the Hyde amendment, which prohibits Federal tax dollars

from funding abortions on demand and has been included in appropriations bills for every year for the past 45 years.

We will restore the Weldon amendment, which protects American doctors, nurses, and other healthcare professionals from participating in or providing an abortion if they have a moral objection to that procedure.

We will restore the Dornan amendment, which prevents District of Columbia resident taxpayer moneys from being used for abortions on demand.

We will restore the Smith amendment, which prevents the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan from subsidizing abortions on demand for Federal workers.

We will restore the Helms amendment, which prevents American taxpayers from financing abortions to foreign organizations or countries.

Regardless of one's personal views, lawmakers and Presidents of both parties have always agreed that Americans should not be forced to pay for abortions on demand with their hard-earned tax dollars.

It is not too late for Democrats to change course, abandon their radical, far-left policies, and restore these important protections before a final vote on this measure. Every Democrat who is not a freshman has voted to support this language and these amendments on this floor, and we know they must again if any of these appropriations bills are ever to become law.

All Republicans in the House stand united with the American people on this issue, and none will support appropriations bills that do not include these important pro-life protections.

We urge Democrats to accept the motion to recommit, restore these bipartisan compromises, and allow appropriations bills to move forward toward a final negotiation in good faith. Ultimately, failure to do so will result in either a continuing resolution or, even worse, a government shutdown later this year. Neither outcome should ever be acceptable to any Member on this floor.

Let me now turn, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to an issue that is more parochial but where the outlook is more promising. That is the Federal response to the so-called *McGirt* decision by the United States Supreme Court.

Many Members will not be aware of this, but last year, the Supreme Court decided that much of Oklahoma, for the purposes of criminal prosecution, remains Indian Country.

In Indian Country, only the Federal Government and Tribal law enforcement officials can prosecute Indians who commit crimes, again, on Indian reservations. That, obviously, in the State of Oklahoma, will now call for enormously robust Federal law enforcement and Tribal law enforcement capabilities.

I am happy to report that in one of the measures that we face today, that reality has been taken into account.

Frankly, our friends, the Biden administration, asked for an additional \$70 million for the Department of Justice to finance additional U.S. attorneys, additional Federal marshals, and additional FBI for Oklahoma to respond to the *McGirt* decision.

Sadly, our friends did not request similar funds for Tribal law enforcement officials, and none of the bills in front of us actually deal with that issue.

Last night, we placed an amendment dealing with this before this House. It was part of an en bloc amendment. I actually believe if it had come on its own, it would have passed. But it failed.

However, the appropriations process is a long process, and I think negotiations in good faith with the full committee will eventually result in additional Federal dollars for law enforcement.

Regardless, that Supreme Court decision, the *McGirt* decision, means the Federal Government and Tribal law enforcement officials must do more in this area. Again, one of the bills in front of us helps with regard to the Federal Government. I am hopeful, in the final negotiations, we can do more on *McGirt*.

My last point, Mr. Speaker, is simply to say we need to look at all of these bills collectively. Just as a piece of friendly advice to my friends, if we are going to get to a deal, three things absolutely have to happen.

The first is, the amount of money we spend on defense simply must go up. There is not enough money in the bills passed out of the Appropriations Committee to adequately fund our defense in a dangerous world.

Second, the outrageous domestic explosion of spending must come down. We simply, as my friend from Pennsylvania pointed out, can't afford a spending spree.

Finally, and most importantly, and my friends need to realize this politically, for any of these bills to pass the United States Senate and ultimately become law, all the pro-life provisions that they have systematically stripped out of these bills have to be restored. Otherwise, my friends will get Donald Trump's last negotiated budget for the second year of the Biden administration. I don't think that is what they want, but that is exactly where we are headed unless they change course and work with us to preserve these long-standing, pro-life protections that have been in these bills for, in many cases, decades.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I do want to respond to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma and friend from the Rules Committee as it relates to the *McGirt* decision. I share his concerns for the challenges being faced by the people in the State of Oklahoma. I know his amendment has been made in order. Without regard to how that vote takes place, I would

love to work with him—and, I am sure, others would—to address the real concerns by the people of the State of Oklahoma. I look forward to that conversation.

I do want, before I yield to my friend, to mention that I talked, in my opening comments, about some of the things that are in the bill. I do want to highlight some of the important things in the Legislative Branch appropriations, which provides \$4.8 billion, an increase of nearly 14 percent.

I mentioned earlier that we hope to build upon the emergency supplemental bill, which we passed in May, that would continue to support the Capitol Police, National Guard, et cetera. In this bill, we put money to improve training and bolster wellness support for the Capitol Police, who were attacked on January 6, and provide funding to hire up to over 2,100 sworn officers and 450 civilian members of the Capitol Police and more resources for recruitment, retention, and readiness for them.

We strengthened congressional capacity. It increases funding for congressional offices to help recruit and retain a talented and diverse staff and supports mental health and wellness for Members and staff.

We always talk about being Article I of the Constitution, and we really need to support that legislative branch and make sure we have the resources to be able to provide balanced, thoughtful support for the American public.

I wanted to highlight some of the really important things. I appreciate, certainly, Chairman RYAN and the work that he, the ranking member, and the members of that subcommittee did in getting that bill before the House and the rule that we are debating right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL), my colleague and friend.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this SFOPs bill, which, in the words of President Biden, says that the United States is back on the world stage.

The bill reflects the importance of diplomatic and development assistance and cooperation with valuable partners to advance peace and prosperity around the world. It rebuilds public health infrastructure, confronts climate change, and advances basic education in undeveloped nations.

On a subject I know that we can agree on, on both sides of the aisle, the bill is proudly pro-Israel. It fulfills our commitment to Israel, whose security in a very, very dangerous region of the world is America's security, too. We expand our development partnership between our two countries to work together and improve lives around the world in poor areas.

I say to my colleagues, let's maintain this bipartisan support to our very good friend, Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also recognizes that when girls and women succeed,

the world succeeds. The bill invests in education, health and maternal care, economic opportunity, and combating barriers to success like gender-based violence and child marriage. It supports the implementation of the "Women, Peace and Security" strategy.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, this bill removes the harmful Helms amendment, which restricts U.S. funding for abortion services around the world, and removes the global gag rule, which forces healthcare providers to choose between U.S. global health assistance and the ability to counsel and provide clients with accurate and a full range of safe and legal reproductive options.

The gag rule has resulted in good and honest healthcare providers turning down United States financial assistance, forcing the closure of clinics around the world, leaving more than a million women without access to healthcare, including reproductive care.

Yesterday, I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about restricting abortion in the United States. Now, today, it is Ghana and the rest of the world. I want to say to my colleagues, let me respectfully clue you in that in poor, undeveloped countries, you are not stopping abortions. You are stopping safe abortions. Unsafe abortions are responsible for 13 percent of maternal deaths around the world.

Let me give you another clue. The best way to stop abortions is with access to family planning and contraception, which is in this very, very good bill.

I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about polling, and I say polling, schmolling. Polls say one thing; polls say another thing. I want to ask you, has any woman or even man in the world taken a poll to decide whether or not they should become a parent? I don't think so.

I am talking about past bills that have had these terrible provisions, the gag rule, the Helms amendment, and so forth. You know that sometimes you go along not because you want to go along. This has been the case for many of us with these provisions.

Let me just say as loud as possible, women cannot live their full potential unless they get to make their own decisions about parenthood. So, removing the global gag rule and the Helms amendment makes this such a very, very good bill that I celebrate today. This is an important bill, and I support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Biden administration has extended border shutdowns with Mexico and Canada, extended European and other international travel restrictions, and has reimposed mask mandates for fully vaccinated people, contradicting

previous CDC guidance and, sadly, choosing to follow the political science, not the science.

But, Mr. Speaker, the chaos at our southern border, where illegal immigrants have been apprehended from over 160 countries, undermines any efforts to prevent the spread of COVID-19. That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider Congresswoman YVETTE HERRELL's PAUSE Act of 2021.

This legislation would provide for stringent enforcement of Title 42, a public health order allowing illegal immigrants to be quickly expelled from the United States, and would prohibit HHS and DHS from weakening Title 42's implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

□ 1100

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), a doctor and my good friend, who is here to explain the amendment.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can take up H.R. 471, the PAUSE Act, which was introduced by my colleague and friend, Representative YVETTE HERRELL. As a physician and former Director of Public Health for the State of Iowa, I am proud to cosponsor this legislation, and I believe we must bring this to the floor today.

This legislation would prohibit the Federal Government from ceasing or lessening the implementation of COVID-19 border health provisions until the COVID-19 public health emergency is no longer in effect, both at the Federal level and all 50 States.

At the start of the pandemic last year, through the Centers for Disease Control, President Trump implemented Title 42 border health restrictions. These commonsense restrictions ensure that people crossing our northern and southern border do not present a public health risk to our country. President Biden, to his credit, had left some of these restrictions in place as our country works to eradicate the COVID-19 pandemic, until now.

Now, the Biden administration is considering eliminating Title 42 border health restrictions and allowing individuals who pose a health risk to enter into our country.

This comes in the same week where the President is considering requiring Federal employees to be vaccinated because of the delta variant, and this comes a day after this Chamber is re-

implementing a mask policy due to rising cases of COVID-19 across the country, and the Senate is not.

Mr. Speaker, the President is rightfully concerned about the rising number of COVID cases across the country, the vast majority of which are among the unvaccinated. While the President and I have different ideas on the best way to stop this virus, it is clear we all want Americans to be safe and healthy from this virus.

Yet, while this administration is considering more COVID restrictions for American citizens on one hand, it is planning to loosen restrictions on migrants at the border on the other. This has opened our borders to an unparalleled surge that is not diminishing and is also risking bringing north the lambda variant, just as the Texas House Democrats brought north the delta variant.

This administration is considering ending Title 42 restrictions in the middle of a public health crisis at our southern border. Last week, reports indicated that the number of migrants who tested positive for COVID-19 in the Rio Grande Valley sector has increased by 900 percent. Last month alone, over 188,000 migrants were encountered at the border, and 105,000 of those were turned away under Title 42 restrictions.

If we are going to eradicate COVID, we cannot afford to repeal Title 42. Lifting these restrictions would threaten the health and safety of U.S. citizens and could lead to higher levels of migration. Our Border Patrol agents and CBP officers are already dealing with migration surges, they support the continuance of Title 42, and we must ensure that they have the tools and processes needed to protect themselves and our country. This includes the ability to process migrants under Title 42 health restrictions until the public health emergency ends.

Additionally, testing for COVID-19 should be done at all airports or other ports of entry.

Eliminating Title 42 would only exacerbate the current administration's crisis at our southern border and likely lead to an increased public health crisis. Failure to either close the border or continue Title 42 puts all American lives at risk, both vaccinated and unvaccinated.

I urge Americans to get vaccinated so we can eradicate this virus.

I urge the President not to repeal Title 42 restrictions.

And I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring the PAUSE Act to the floor and keep Title 42 border health restrictions in place until the end of the COVID-19 public health emergency.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the previous speaker for her encouragement of all Americans to be vaccinated. We certainly want to continue to promote that message and urge everyone in the United States to be vaccinated.

Mr. Speaker, in my previous comments, I talked about the congressional and legislative appropriations.

I include in the RECORD a July 13 Business Insider article entitled: "Capitol Hill staff take second jobs with Postmates, Starbucks, and J. Crew to make up for their low salaries."

I continue to repeat that men and women who work here shouldn't struggle to make ends meet just because they have dedicated their careers to public service.

[July 13, 2021]

CAPITOL HILL STAFF TAKE SECOND JOBS WITH POSTMATES, STARBUCKS, AND J. CREW TO MAKE UP FOR THEIR LOW SALARIES

(By Kayla Epstein)

With no choice but to accept low pay, Capitol Hill staffers often have to pick up second jobs.

Retail, gig-economy, and service-industry jobs are frequent options.

Staffers told Insider the second jobs add to an already stressful workload and lead to burnout.

The next time you order takeout in the DC area, your delivery person might work for Congress.

Given no choice but to accept startlingly low salaries in exchange for the privilege of working on Capitol Hill, many interns and junior staffers to America's most powerful—and wealthy—politicians take second jobs to survive in Washington, DC, one of the most expensive cities in the country.

Some staffers and interns go for gig-economy roles like Postmates, Uber, and DoorDash, while others work as baristas and bartenders. For those who struggle to afford a professional wardrobe, retail jobs help provide additional wages and a discount on clothes.

While it's common for people in the US to work second jobs to make ends meet, civic groups and staffers say that low pay on Capitol Hill pushes out talented staff and creates an environment in which employees from privileged backgrounds have an edge in building long-term careers.

"You could tell when certain people kind of came from money and didn't have to" work second jobs, one former staffer to a House Republican said. "I have some friends that didn't need to because they came up from a wealthy upbringing . . . They were comfortable. Others were kind of like, 'OK, yeah, I need to really do some extra jobs because this is not livable.'"

Insider spoke to five current and former staffers who had worked second jobs as a way to compensate for what one former senior Democratic House aide called "poverty wages." They described exhaustion and burnout from pulling double duty, their only days off eaten up by delivering takeout or grabbing graveyard shifts at clothing stores. Some spoke on the condition of anonymity because they feared losing their jobs or hurting their careers by speaking out.

"It's tough for the normal traditional staffer because that is easily a 50- to 60-hour week," said one former House and Senate aide who started out at \$27,000 a year and had to take a second job at apparel company J.Crew.

When you add on the additional hours for a second job, he said, "you just burn yourself out to stay afloat."

Do you have a tip about Capitol Hill workplace issues to share? Bad bosses, toxic offices, or questionable behavior toward congressional staffers? Insider is continuing to cover Congress as a workplace.

AN OPEN SECRET

The fact that many congressional employees take on second jobs has been an open se-

cret on the Hill for years. But when some staffers do seek outside work, they face repercussions.

Audrey Henson, who was a Republican House aide making \$25,000 before she founded the internship placement program College to Congress, said she faced pushback from her manager when she took a bartending job near the Hill.

"I would work until 2, 3 in the morning on a Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday night. I'd come into Congress absolutely exhausted," she said of her job, which she held from 2013 to 2014.

"Whenever I was having to pick up more shifts at the bar, and then when I ended up getting a weekend job, I was talked to by my chief of staff about priorities," she told Insider. "And he was like, 'This job should be your priority.'"

"I said, quite frankly, it is. I'm only doing these other jobs so that I can give you more," Henson said. "Trust me, this is my only priority. Those jobs allow me to afford this job."

She worked at Union Pub, a popular watering hole on Capitol Hill.

"I was like, I'm up here to work in Congress, and I'm putting in equal hours at Union Pub. There's an issue with this picture," she said. "And I wasn't alone."

Union Pub spokesperson Sam Sanchez said that, "pre-pandemic, Capitol Hill staffers made up a good portion of our staff working as part-time servers or bartenders—more than 50% at times."

One current Democratic House staffer, who started in DC before eventually making her way back to a district office, worked at a law firm and a retail store to make it through her part-time, unpaid Senate internship.

"I would do a shipment shift at like 3:30 in the morning, go to the law firm, and go to my internship," she said. "I was working seven days a week . . . I wanted to work somewhere I could buy work clothes because it's very expensive."

After her predawn store shift, "I would leave at 7, go catch the Metro" to her law firm gig, she said.

As a part-time Senate intern, she didn't get any travel benefits.

"I spent \$260 a month on my Metro," she said.

Even after getting a full-time role with a committee, she continued to work her \$10-per-hour retail job on the weekends to have enough spending money and afford work clothes.

"It was exhausting all the time. But in my mind it's what I had to do for the job on the Hill," she said. "I didn't have much of a social life. I kind of missed out on a few years of my 20s just working myself to death."

Union Pub, a popular bar near Capitol Hill in Washington, DC. ERIC BARADAT/AFP via Getty Images.

"I was giving up a lot."

Other Hill veterans echoed the detrimental impact of holding a second job while working full-time in Congress. Instead of using weekends to recuperate from weeks of late-night votes, political chaos, and a stressful office environment, they had to spend their time finding ways to make money.

The former Republican House staffer started driving for Postmates to bolster his \$30,500 salary.

"I would typically do it Friday evening, Saturday, Sunday," he said. He could make about \$200 to \$300 a month from Postmates but had to "really grind to make those numbers."

"I was making money, to have extra money, but I was also giving up a lot," he said. "And it was just really hard sometimes to do my second job because I wanted to go out, I wanted to have fun, I wanted to just be

lazy on a Saturday or Sunday. I wanted just to be able to relax."

Sometimes, the staffers said, the stress affected their physical health, too. One current staffer told Insider that the exhaustion of working sunrise Starbucks shifts on top of her Hill internship made her hair fall out.

"I wasn't getting a lot of sleep. I was looking very tired," she said. "I was breaking out a lot. My hair was not in great shape—it was thinning out."

"They're missing out on the most talented people."

House and Senate offices and committees have only so much money to spend, and that allotment must fund everything, including travel, office supplies, direct mail, and staff salaries. Each office functions like its own business, determining pay and the number of workers and interns. There is no formal human resources office on Capitol Hill that can help regulate pay for certain jobs, and the pay band system that exists across the federal government to standardize salaries doesn't apply to Congress.

On June 14, Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez of New York and more than 100 Democratic lawmakers sent a letter to the House Appropriations Committee to demand an increase in the Members' Representational Allowance, the pool of funding that is distributed equally among all House offices.

"For years, pay and benefits for the staff of Member offices, leadership offices, and committees have fallen farther and farther behind what is offered in the private sector," the lawmakers wrote.

A few days later, the House Appropriations Committee released its legislative funding bill that calls for a \$134 million increase to the MRA. It would also increase the spending for intern pay and committee budgets.

But there's no guarantee that the extra money to the MRA would go toward bolstering staff salaries. And many House offices still don't properly use the money available for internships, said Carlos Vera, executive director of the advocacy group Pay Our Interns.

Low pay is simply accepted as the cost of admission into the legislative branch, and many job candidates fear attempting to negotiate with hiring managers because of the scarcity of these opportunities.

But Henson, who bartended, said it's long past time for that to change. Forcing staffers to work themselves to the point of burnout hinders their ability to do their jobs for the American people, she said.

"What other profession do we ask full-time professionals to be a barista on the side?" Henson said. "What if you had professional athletes leave practice every day to work at Starbucks? Would they be winners? Would the teams be getting the best talent? No."

"That's what's happening in Congress," she added. "They're missing out on the most talented people because they're not paying them."

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, having talked about the legislative branch, let me take just a moment now to talk about where we are globally with this appropriations bill.

The State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee asks for an increase of more than 12 percent, an appropriation of \$62 billion to support the displaced and vulnerable, rebuild public health infrastructure, confront climate change, advance women's health, and promote democracy.

If I could take just a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight some

of these things, particularly as it relates to rebuilding the public health infrastructure.

The rule which supports the underlying bill would dramatically increase funding to confront the current COVID-19 pandemic, prevent future pandemics, and shore up gains made in global health. It includes \$10.6 billion to support the health of families and communities around the world. The total includes a billion dollars for global health security to prevent future pandemics through both bilateral and multilateral mechanisms, something that is critical to stop the spread of future pandemics.

It also places a premium on confronting climate change and the climate crisis by expanding global efforts to address environmental threats and reduce emissions, with over \$3 billion to address the climate crisis and other environmental programs and includes the first direct appropriations for the Green Climate Fund, to the tune of a \$1.6 billion investment.

It also promotes democracy around the world, provides funding to support allies and partners of the United States with a \$1.6 billion appropriation to promote a free and open Indo-Pacific and help counter the growing influence of the People's Republic of China in developing countries, something that I think people on both sides of the aisle know is a growing threat to freedom and democracy around the world. It also funds a \$2.517 billion effort to increase democracy programs and provides \$300 million for the National Endowment for Democracy.

For those of us who care deeply about the world in which we live and care deeply about those countries that seek to limit democratic institutions and democracy, this is welcome news and I think very, very appropriate to the American values which we hold so dear.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely disappointed that an amendment offered by my good friend, Mr. MICHAEL WALTZ from Florida, was not made in order under today's rule.

This amendment would support a diplomatic boycott of the 2022 Olympic Games in Beijing. I would actually support a total boycott of the Olympic Games in Beijing. But just looking at the diplomatic boycott, China has an abysmal record on human rights. They currently are housing Uighurs in concentration camps in western China, they are using slave labor, and even forced organ harvesting.

The CCP, the Chinese Communist Party, exports fentanyl to the United States, steals our trade secrets, and constantly threatens to invade the free and independent nation of Taiwan.

The last thing we need to do is to reward the CCP with the economic ben-

efit and, frankly, the cachet on the world stage by hosting the Olympic Games. I just wish that my liberal colleagues across the aisle had allowed us to debate at least a diplomatic boycott of the Beijing Olympic Games.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. McCLAIN).

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the radical, partisan, and polarizing appropriations bill the Democrats are ramming through this Chamber.

It wasn't enough for the Democrats to disregard the opinion of an overwhelming majority of Americans who do not want their tax dollars being used to bankroll abortions here in the U.S. In this appropriations bill, they want to take it a step further and export abortion around the world. You heard it right.

The Helms amendment, which pre-dates the Hyde amendment, ensures that U.S. tax dollars do not fund abortion through foreign assistance programs. Foreign assistance programs should help defend our country. Democrats felt the need to strip it from this bill.

My constituents do not want their hard-earned tax dollars shipped overseas to kill unborn children. And you know what? Neither do 77 percent of Americans, according to a January 2021 Marist poll. Yet, Democrats are saying they are giving people what they want. Well, that is a flat-out lie.

Who exactly are they catering to with this radical move? Far left-wing activists?

I am disgusted by some in this Chamber and the President for their shameful disregard of taxpayer wishes; their hypocritical double standards; and, most importantly, their shameful disregard for human life.

As a reminder to this administration and my colleagues, I am wearing flip-flops today so they can be reminded of this administration's ability to flip-flop on issues. This administration could not be consistent if their life depended on it, or worse, ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just take a moment to dive a little deeper in the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies appropriation, and thank, again, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, for the great work that he did in getting the appropriations bill before the House.

Overall, the appropriation bill provides \$81.6 billion, an increase of 14 percent, to create jobs, support safer communities, and confront the climate crisis here at home.

I would like to take just a moment to highlight some of the specifics, because it is important, as the American public observes the conversation going on

here in the Congress about what our priorities are. Budgets always describe our priorities and our values.

For instance, this bill provides \$25 billion, an increase of \$1.77 billion for NASA, with strong funding and a total effort to gain scientific knowledge about the Earth's changing climate.

It includes \$6.46 billion for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for climate research and mitigation efforts, including improvements to weather forecasting, understanding the impact and degree of sea level rise, supporting offshore wind energy, fisheries management, and STEM education.

It fosters innovation in U.S. economic competitiveness with \$9.63 billion for the National Science Foundation to support climate science and sustainable research, as well as research on artificial intelligence, quantum information science, advanced manufacturing, cybersecurity, and other critical research efforts, which I might say, parenthetically, is critically important, not only for economic security, not only for the climate crisis, but for national security as we confront these threats across the globe.

In this bill we also address gender-based violence, providing \$753.8 million for Violence Against Women's Act prevention and prosecution programs and includes \$60 million for grants to reduce the backlog of unprocessed rape kits, which is critically important.

This bill also provides support to create good-paying jobs for Americans, including providing \$10.95 billion for the Department of Commerce, an increase of \$2.03 billion, with investments in economic development in distressed communities and support for small businesses, including small- and medium-sized American manufacturers, as we continue to be concerned about the supply chain and the value chain as it relates to not only competitiveness by American companies but also, again, to make sure that we support our warfighters, and to make sure the supply chain for critical components and parts is ready for the defense of our Nation.

It invests directly in our communities, with \$433.1 million for the Economic Development Administration, an increase of \$87 million, to boost economically recovering areas and launch innovative community development efforts, as well as \$275 million for the very important Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, which we utilize in my community and others across the country, and an increase of \$125 million to help small- and medium-sized United States manufacturers create and preserve jobs.

Much of this will also be involved with making sure that people who have been displaced because of the pandemic economically will have opportunities to go into new industries and be trained, as well as make sure that incumbent workers continue to upgrade their skills so they can be competitive

in what is a very, very competitive global economic environment.

So I want to highlight those, Mr. Speaker. I know that I just talked about a lot of things that are not before the House, but I thought I would spend just a few moments talking about what is actually before the House and some of the critical investments that we are making in the bills that are before us.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what my colleague earlier offered as the previous question with respect to Title 42, because what we are seeing at the border is an absolute travesty, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to do nothing, literally nothing about that today, even as we see people spilling across the border who are clearly testing positive for COVID.

We have a hotel in La Joya, Texas, that is literally filled right now with individuals who are heavily testing positive for COVID. These are the facts on the ground.

I know my friend, the Speaker, knows how bad it is at the border, knows how bad it is in Laredo, knows how bad it is in Del Rio, knows how bad it is in McAllen.

I have got a text here from a sheriff in a small Texas town saying, "We are passing an emergency declaration tonight at city council that no illegal immigrants can be released in the city of Uvalde per the CDC guidelines of countries on their list without a negative COVID test. We have had our health authority write orders that give us the authority to have them, government, Border Patrol, and immigrants, quarantine for 10 to 14 days.

We have a crisis at our border, and we are playing footsie with mask mandates in the people's House. I mean, it is absolutely absurd what this body is doing, the people's House. It is an embarrassment. It is a mockery.

The American people are fed up. They want to go back to life. They want to go back to business. They want to go back to school without their children being forced to wear masks, to be put in the corner, to have mental health issues.

We are running around here, and the Speaker comes down here at 10 a.m. saying we have got to wear masks in the people's House while we have got thousands of people pouring across our border, and Democrats don't do a darn thing about it.

Heavily infected with COVID.

We have The New York Times today.

What a mess. CDC about to reverse on indoor masking for the vaccinated.

This is some serious nanny-state stuff that will only breed resentment. No kidding.

Consider resentment being magnified right here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We are absolutely sick and tired of it. So are the American people. This sham of an institution is doing nothing for the American people. Nothing for the betterment of the people that send their Representatives here.

I just met this morning with an organization that tries to take care of people from human trafficking; met with an elected official from Mexico while cartels are raping and pillaging and killing. And we have people infected with COVID coming across our southern border into Texas. And you all put masks, masks up front here? Here in the people's House? We have got to go around and see, okay, I can't come to the floor, I can't execute my constitutional duty unless I wear a mask.

Which is it, vaccines or masks? Do the vaccines work or don't they work? Do the masks work or don't they work? I would like to know which it is. I would like Dr. Fauci to come down and answer a single question about natural immunity. If you have been infected with the virus, do you have immunity? Or are they just going to go around poking people saying: You must take a vaccine. Oh, but sorry, the vaccine doesn't work. You must wear a mask.

This institution is a sham, and we should adjourn and shut this place down.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just remind folks that the Members of the House who are on the floor today are working very hard to make sure that we pass appropriations to support the American people, to create jobs, to make America safe, to make our interests around the world known.

I do want to talk a little bit about making our communities safer, because there are substantial resources in the appropriations bill to do just that, providing resources for local law enforcement who are facing a period of great challenge: \$360 million for Byrne Justice Assistance Grants; \$156.5 million for COPS hiring grants, it takes concrete actions and provides resources for meaningful police reform initiatives, including requiring recipients of Federal law enforcement funding to comply with requirements in the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act; provides \$100 million for community-based violence intervention initiatives; addresses the epidemic of gun violence in the United States with \$100 million to strengthen the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; \$40 million to incentivize States to establish or refine red flag and gun licensing laws; and \$10 million to develop and expand gun buy-back and relinquishment programs.

We are working very, very hard, Mr. Speaker. We are trying to move ahead for the American people who have been through one of the most difficult times in the history of our country, in the

history of the world, a pandemic which has killed hundreds of thousands of Americans. We do see rising rates of infection. If you look at and do the correlation of those States who have the lowest vaccination rates, that is where the greatest numbers of those infections are occurring.

And we are working hard. We are trying to move forward an agenda that will serve all Americans from a public health perspective, from an economic recovery perspective, and how to move forward and build this country back better and make sure that all people in America, every American citizen has the right, the opportunity, the potential to meet their dreams and aspirations.

That is our work before the House, and we are not going to be distracted. We are not going to be taken down the proverbial rabbit hole. We have work to do, and that is the work before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), my good friend.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, to comment on my Democrat colleague's comments that they are just trying to build America back better, nobody in the United States of America in their right mind believes that what is happening in this country—the disastrous economic policies, the spike in crime in the neighborhoods from sea to shining sea, the chaos that burns out of control at the border—believes that you are trying to make America better.

I associate myself with the comments of Representative ROY from the Lone Star State. It is absurd for us to be mandating and restricting the American people when we have hundreds of thousands of people pouring into this country, and in the last 2 weeks we had a 900 percent increase in COVID-positive people illegally crossing our sovereign border into the United States.

We can't take anybody seriously, not the President, and with all due respect, not our colleagues who think they are trying to make our country better, stronger, and safer. That is just absurd. It is ridiculous.

I can hardly get through my comments about the appropriations on account of some of this rhetoric that is empty. It is absolutely hollow in the ears of those who hear it who live on the border and who are experiencing the devastating effects; not the least of which are the poor, vulnerable people who are coming over here and paying a high price by the cartels who we, because of the policies of this administration, are enriching and empowering every day.

I rise in strong opposition and great concern as a result of the proposed massive and irresponsible spending bills that reflect, Mr. Speaker, the

Democrats' insatiable desire to expand the Federal Government beyond recognition, beyond the recognition not only of our Founders, but of our citizens here today, and to, once again, jam through their partisan priorities.

These spending levels are beyond fiscally unsustainable. They are going to push us to the brink of bankruptcy, into a place where we can see the sovereign debt crisis from the precipice upon which we stand. We won't be able to print money or borrow to bail out of that crisis, Mr. Speaker.

American families have worked hard. They have made sacrifices, tightening up their belts. And by the way, dealing with the every-man tax of inflation while our Democrat colleagues continue to push these massive spending bills. It is completely irresponsible.

It is unbelievable that my Democrat colleagues would ask the American people for a 21 percent pay raise, \$100 billion. The White House wants a 40 percent pay raise for the crimes fight, for the chaos at the border, for the inflation, for the fact that their policies have locked people into unemployment, and the policies they are proposing will trap them in poverty for the rest of their lives, and generations to follow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to my good friend.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, aside from the insulting disregard for our national debt for our children and grandchildren, this is the greatest threat. It is not the existential threats. It is our insatiable appetite to expand the government, government's power, and the costs associated.

If these bills, these supposed funding bills are enacted, here are the policies that will follow:

Abortion providers will be funded and abortion, and the abortion manufacturers that abort, terminate unborn children at a rate of almost 1,000 a day.

Allow illegal immigrants to receive our tax dollar financial aid and Federal employment. What a disrespect to the law-abiding American citizens.

Choke out our ag and energy producers with extreme environmental policies, disrupt the supply chain, undermine our ag and energy independence.

The list is too long, Mr. Speaker.

Give contraceptives to students without parental knowledge.

Fund sex changes at the VA.

These are the priorities, these are the values reflected in the budget of my colleagues?

Mr. Speaker, this is a radical re-imagination of government's role in the life of its citizens and a drastic departure from America's values and interests, and I oppose it. I pray to God I can get a Democrat to oppose it. I doubt it.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Roy moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 225, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

YEAS—197

Aderholt	Gohmert	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Miller-Meeks
Amodei	Gonzalez (OH)	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Mooney
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Babin	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Baird	Granger	Mullin
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Banks	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Barr	Green (TN)	Norman
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Nunes
Bergman	Griffith	Oberholte
Bice (OK)	Grothman	Owens
Biggs	Guest	Palazzo
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Palmer
Bishop (NC)	Hagedorn	Pence
Boebert	Harris	Perry
Bost	Harshbarger	Pfleger
Brady	Hern	Posey
Brooks	Herrell	Reed
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler
Buck	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Hinson	Rose
Burchett	Hollingsworth	Rosendale
Burgess	Hudson	Rouzer
Calvert	Huizenga	Roy
Cammack	Issa	Rutherford
Carl	Jackson	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Jacobs (NY)	Scalise
Cawthorn	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Cloyd	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Clyde	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Katko	Smucker
Crawford	Keller	Spartz
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Staubert
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Steel
Davidson	Kim (CA)	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff	Steil
DesJarlais	LaHood	Steube
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Stewart
Donalds	Lamborn	Taylor
Duncan	Latta	Tenney
Dunn	LaTurner	Tiffany
Emmer	Lesko	Timmons
Estes	Long	Turner
Fallon	Loudermilk	Upton
Feenstra	Lucas	Valadao
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Fischbach	Mace	Van Dуйne
Fitzgerald	Malliotakis	Wagner
Fleischmann	Mann	Walberg
Fortenberry	Massie	Walorski
Fox	Mast	Waltz
Franklin, C.	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Scott	McCaull	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	McClain	Wenstrup
Gaetz	McClintock	Westerman
Gallagher	McHenry	Williams (TX)
Garbarino	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Garcia (CA)	Meijer	Wittman
Gibbs	Meuser	Womack
Gimenez	Miller (IL)	Zeldin

NAYS—225

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguiar	Gonzalez,	Omar
Allred	Vicente	Pallone
Auchincloss	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Bacon	Grijalva	Pascarell
Barragan	Harder (CA)	Payne
Beatty	Hayes	Perlmutter
Bera	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Beyer	Himes	Phillips
Bishop (GA)	Horsford	Pingree
Blumenauer	Houlahan	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Hoyer	Porter
Bonamici	Huffman	Pressley
Bourdeaux	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Bowman	Jacobs (CA)	Quigley
Boyle, Brendan	Jayapal	Raskin
F.	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Brown	Johnson (GA)	Rice (SC)
Brownley	Johnson (TX)	Ross
Bush	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Bustos	Kahele	Ruiz
Butterfield	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Carbajal	Keating	Rush
Cardenas	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Carson	Khanna	Sanchez
Carter (LA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cartwright	Kilmer	Scanlon
Case	Kim (NJ)	Schakowsky
Casten	Kind	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cheney	Kuster	Schrier
Chu	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Cicilline	Langevin	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cleaver	Lawrence	Sherrill
Clyburn	Lawson (FL)	Simpson
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Sires
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Slotkin
Cooper	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)
Correa	Letlow	Soto
Costa	Levin (CA)	Spanberger
Courtney	Levin (MI)	Speier
Craig	Lieu	Stansbury
Crist	Lofgren	Stanton
Crow	Lowenthal	Stevens
Cuellar	Luria	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Suozi
Davis, Danny K.	Malinowski	Swalwell
Dean	Maloney,	Takano
DeFazio	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Manning	Titus
DelBene	Matsui	Tlaib
Delgado	McBath	Tonko
Demings	McCollum	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	McEachin	Torres (NY)
Deutch	McGovern	Trahan
Dingell	McNerney	Trone
Doggett	Meeks	Underwood
Doyle, Michael	Meng	Vargas
F.	Mfume	Veasey
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Vela
Eshoo	Morelle	Velazquez
Espallat	Moulton	Wasserman
Evans	Mrvan	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Fletcher	Murphy (NC)	Watson Coleman
Foster	Nadler	Welch
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Wexton
Galleo	Neal	Wild
Garamendi	Neguse	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Newman	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Yarmuth
Golden	O'Halleran	

NOT VOTING—8

Bass	Higgins (LA)	Thompson (PA)
Carter (GA)	Kinziger	Young
Hartzler	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1201

Messrs. GARCÍA of Illinois and HUFFMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. BURCHETT, and Ms. FOXX changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.